6. IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter identifies steps towards implementation of the proposed facilities and programs of this plan, the estimated costs for the proposed improvements and maintenance, and strategies on funding and financing.

6.1. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The steps between the network improvements and concepts identified in this Plan and the final completion of the improvements will vary from project to project, but typically include:

1. Adoption of the Fremont Bicycle Master Plan by the Fremont City Council.
2. Preparation of a Feasibility Study involving a conceptual design (with consideration of possible alternatives and environmental issues) and cost estimate for individual projects as needed.
3. Secure, as necessary, outside funding and any applicable environmental approvals.
4. Consider the parking needs of businesses and residents in the development of new bicycle lanes through a thorough community engagement process
5. Approval of the project by the Planning Commission and the City Council, including the commitment by the latter to provide for any unfunded portions of project costs.
6. Completion of final plans, specifications and estimates, advertising for bids, receipt of bids and award of contract(s).
7. Construction of Project.

6.2. HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS

Once a bikeway system has been identified, the greatest challenge is to identify the top priority projects that will offer the greatest benefit to bicyclists if implemented. Prioritization involves a number of factors, including: (a) cost and construction feasibility given existing traffic, safety, and environmental constraints; (b) need, benefit, and public support; (c) funding cycles and opportunities, and strength of the project as measured by specific funding criteria.

During Public Workshop #2, held in April 2005 to present the Draft Bicycle Master Plan, the BPTAC and members of the public provided input on prioritizing the list of projects discussed in Chapter 5. Based on the public and BPTAC input, those projects that were prioritized highest include:

- Fremont Boulevard to Dixon Landing Connector (either a Class I or Class II option)

- Osgood Road Bike Lanes (Washington to Auto Mall)
- Union Pacific Rail Trail
- Paseo Padre Parkway Bike Lanes (Driscoll to Washington)
- Central Avenue Improvements (Class II or Class III Shared Use)
- Mowry Avenue Class III Shared Use
- Educational and Encouragement Programs

It is important to remember that the lists of bikeway projects and programs are flexible concepts that serve as guidelines to those responsible for implementation. The High Priority project list, and perhaps even the overall system and segments themselves, may change over time as a result of changing bicycling patterns and implementation constraints and opportunities. The Fremont BPTAC, BPAC, and city staff should review the High Priority project list on an annual basis to ensure that it reflects the most current priorities, needs, and opportunities for implementing the bikeway network in a logical and efficient manner., and that in particular the list takes advantage of all available funding opportunities and grant cycles. As projects get implemented and taken off the list, new projects should be moved up into High Priority status.

6.3. COST BREAKDOWN

A breakdown of cost estimates for the recommended bicycle network provided by this plan is presented in **Table 6-1** below. The cost of the recommended projects is estimated to be about $9.1 million for Class I projects, $815,000 for Class II Bike Lane projects, and $180,000 for Class III Bike Route projects, combined for a total system buildout cost of about $10.1 million. It is important to note the two following assumptions about the cost estimates. First, all cost estimates are highly conceptual, since there is no feasibility or preliminary design completed, and second, the costs do not include feasibility/environmental/engineering study costs.

All the projects are recommended to be implemented over the next two to twenty years, or as funding is available. The more expensive projects may take longer to implement. In addition, many funding sources are highly competitive, and therefore impossible to determine exactly which projects will be funded by which funding sources. Timing of projects is also something difficult to pinpoint exactly, due to the dependence on competitive funding sources and, timing of roadway and development, and the overall economy.

The projects listed may be funded through various sources. The funding section in this chapter outlines some of the local, regional, state and federal funding methods and resources for non-motorized transportation projects.

Table 6-1
Recommended Bikeway System Cost Estimates

Name	Start	End	Class	Length (miles)	Cost ($)
Recommended Class I Bike Paths					
AC Creek Trail Connector	Von Euw Cmn.	Alameda Creek Trail	I	0.1	64,771
Dixon Landing Connector - Alongside Bay	Fremont Blvd.	Dixon Landing	I	1.0	535,700
Dixon Landing Connector - Alongside Fremont Blvd.	Fremont Blvd.	Dixon Landing	I	0.6	341,000
Central Park Connector	Albany Cmn.	Stevenson Blvd.	I	0.1	48,950
Farwell Trail	Farwell Drive	Lemke Place	I	0.5	284,900
Hetch Hetchy Trail	Warren Ave.	Scott Creek Road	I	1.8	991,006
Mission Creek Trail	WPRR Rail Trail	Mission Blvd.	I	1.9	1,018,050
SR 84 Extension Trail	Decoto Road	Union City Border	I	1.6	869,000
UPRR Rail Trail	Clarke Drive	Warren Ave.	I	9.0	4,959,350
Total Class I Cost				16.6	*$9,112,727*
Recommended Class II Bike Lanes					
Argonaut Way	Walnut Ave.	Mowry Ave	II	0.4	11,340
Auto Mall Pkwy.	Grimmer Blvd.	I-880 Crossing	II	0.3	7,509
Bart Way	Bart Station	Paseo Padre Pkwy.	II	0.4	10,710
Beacon Ave.	Liberty Street	Fremont Blvd.	II	0.3	9,690
Central Ave.	Blacow Road	Farwell Drive	II	1.3	39,540
Civic Center Drive	Mowry Ave.	Stevenson Blvd.	II	0.6	19,136
Deep Creek	Paseo Padre Pkwy.	Ridgewood Dr.	II	0.5	15,900
Fremont Blvd.	Enea Ct.	Walnut Ave.	II	3.9	117,660
Fremont Blvd.	Industrial Pl.	Lakeview Blvd.	II	2.6	79,494
Isherwood/Quarry Lakes	North of Paseo Padre	Union City Border	II	0.6	17,110
Kato Rd.	Warren Ave.	Warm Springs Blvd.	II	2.5	75,960
Liberty St.	Capitol Ave.	Walnut Ave.	II	0.4	10,950
Mission Blvd.	I-680	South of Telles Ln.	II	0.4	11,823
Mowry Ave.	Mission Blvd.	Existing Mowry Class II	II	0.3	8,400
Niles Blvd.	Second St.	Alameda Creek	II	0.1	4,440
Osgood Road	Washington Blvd.	South Grimmer Blvd.	II	2.1	63,840
Paseo Padre Pkwy.	Driscoll Road	Washington Blvd.	II	1.1	33,927
Paseo Padre Pkwy.	Stevenson Blvd.	Grimmer Blvd.	II	2.0	59,580
Peralta Blvd.	Fremont Blvd.	Mowry Ave	II	1.7	50,820
Proposed Fremont Blvd.	Fremont Blvd.	Fremont Border	II	0.6	19,350
Second St.	Hillview Dr.	Niles Blvd.	II	0.9	26,520
Stanford Ave.	Mission Blvd.	Mission Peak Park	II	0.6	19,350
State St.	Mowry Ave.	Beacon Ave.	II	0.3	8,730

Name	Start	End	Class	Length (miles)	Cost ($)
Walnut Ave.	Fremont Blvd.	Argonaut Way	II	0.3	7,740
Warm Springs Blvd.	Grimmer Blvd.	Mission Blvd.	II	1.4	41,340
Washington Blvd.	Roberts Ave.	Ellsworth St.	II	1.9	55,890
Total Class II Cost				27.2	*$815,409*
Recommended Class III Bike Routes					
Alder Ave.	Nicolet Ave.	Coronado Drive	III	0.9	4,346
Balboa Way	San Pedro Drive	Cabrillo Drive	III	0.2	1,080
Beard Road	Northern Terminus	Milton Street	III	0.6	2,871
Whitehead/Darwin	Beard Road	Cabrillo Drive	III	2.1	10,275
Bidwell Drive	Sundale Drive	Fremont Blvd.	III	0.6	3,141
Blacow Road	Thornton Ave.	Dowling Ave.	III	0.6	2,948
Boone Drive	Wheeler Drive	Blacow Road	III	0.4	1,925
Butano Park Drive	Omar Street	Yellowstone Park Drive	III	0.7	3,481
Cabrillo Drive	Decoto Road	Hansen Ave.	III	1.7	8,552
Cedarwood Drive	Delaware Drive	Doane Street	III	0.4	1,814
Contra Costa Ave.	Thornton Ave.	Hansen Ave.	III	0.2	1,053
Coronado Drive	Nicolet Ave.	Thornton Ave.	III	0.6	3,008
Delaware Drive	Cedarwood Drive	Roberts Ave.	III	0.4	2,089
Doane Street	Fremont Blvd.	Grimmer Blvd.	III	0.7	3,612
Dusterberry Way	Thornton Ave.	Central Ave.	III	0.5	2,720
Eggers Drive	Paseo Padre Pkwy.	Farwell Drive	III	2.0	9,775
Farwell Drive	Central Ave.	Stevenson Blvd.	III	2.3	11,375
Glenmoore Dr.	Peralta Blvd.	Eggers Drive	III	0.6	3,075
Green Valley Road	Scott Creek Road	Milpitas Border	III	0.1	691
H Street	Niles Blvd.	Third Street	III	0.2	752
Hansen Ave.	Dusterberry Way	Blacow Road	III	0.7	3,405
Hilo Street	Robin Street	Omar Street	III	0.7	3,421
Isherwood Way	North of Paseo Padre	Nicolet Ave.	III	0.3	1,430
Logan Drive	Central Ave.	Wheeler Drive	III	1.8	9,136
Main Street	Roberts Ave.	High Street	III	0.2	1,000
Milton Street	Beard Road	Paseo Padre Pkwy.	III	0.3	1,551
Mowry Ave.	Paseo Padre Pkwy.	Argonaut Way	III	0.8	3,810
Nicolet Ave.	Alder Ave.	San Pedro Drive	III	1.6	7,948
Niles Blvd.	Existing Niles Class II	Niles Canyon Road	III	1.2	11,717
Niles Canyon Road	Niles Blvd.	Union City Border	III	1.4	13,800
Omar Street	Stevenson Blvd.	Blacow Road	III	0.8	4,131
Parkside Drive	Mowry Ave.	Paseo Padre Pkwy.	III	0.6	3,079
Patterson Ranch/Commerce	West of Paseo Padre	Ardenwood Blvd	III	0.3	1,634
Peralta Blvd.	Fremont Blvd.	Glenmoor Dr.	III	0.6	3,030
Post St.	Thornton Ave.	Fremont Blvd.	III	0.3	1,580

Name	Start	End	Class	Length (miles)	Cost ($)
Roberts Ave.	Main Street	Delaware Drive	III	1.0	4,990
Robin Street	Hilo Street	Blacow Road	III	0.8	3,760
San Pedro Drive	Nicolet Ave.	Balboa Way	III	0.5	2,580
Scott Creek Road	I-680	Green Valley Road	III	0.2	950
Shinn Street	Peralta Blvd.	Von Euw Cmn.	III	0.3	1,414
Sundale Drive	Liberty Street	Hilo Street	III	2.3	11,740
Von Euw Cmn.	Shinn Street	AC Creek Trail Connector	III	0.1	610
Warren Ave.	Lake View Blvd.	Kato Rd.	III	0.3	1,620
Washington Blvd.	Union St.	Roberts Ave.	III	0.1	650
Yellowstone Park Drive	Grimmer Blvd.	Butano Park Drive	III	0.5	2,425
Total Class III Cost				33.4	*$179,997*
TOTAL SYSTEM COST					**$10,108,133**

*Cost estimates based on cost per mile of:

- Class I = $550,000
- Class II = $30,000
- Class III Arterial/ "Shared Use" = $10,000
- Class III Neighborhood Route = $5,000.

Maintenance costs for the bikeway network will be relatively low due to the limited number of long Class I path facilities. The existing and recommended bikeway network is predominately made up of on-street bike lanes and routes that will be treated as part of the normal roadway maintenance program. As part of the normal roadway maintenance program, extra emphasis should be put on keeping the bike lanes and roadway shoulders clear of debris and keeping vegetation overgrowth from blocking visibility or creeping into the roadway. The other typical maintenance costs for the bikeway network, as shown below in **Table 6-2**, include the maintenance of signage, striping and stencils.

The total annual maintenance cost of the primary bike path system is estimated to be about $14,800 per year when it is fully implemented. Bicycle facility maintenance costs are based on per mile estimate, which covers labor, supplies, and amortized equipment costs for weekly trash removal, monthly sweeping, and bi-annual resurfacing and repair patrols. Other maintenance costs include bike lane line and crosswalk restriping, sweeping debris, and tuning signals for bicycle and pedestrian sensitivity.

Table 6-2
10 Year Operations and Maintenance Cost Estimates for Recommended Bikeway Network

Facility/Program	Unit Cost ($)	Unit Description	Units	Cost	Notes
Class I Maintenance	8,500	Miles/Year	16	$136,000	Lighting and debris and vegetation overgrowth removal.
Class II /Class III Shared Use Maintenance	2,000	Miles/Year	27	$54,000	Repainting lane stripes and stencils, sign replacement as needed
Class III Neighborhood Maintenance	1,000	Miles/Year	33	$33,000	Sign and shared use stencil replacement as needed
		10-Year Cost		**$223,000**	
		Avg. Cost/Year		**$22,300**	

6.4. FUNDING

There are a variety of potential funding sources including local, state, regional, and federal funding programs that can be used to construct the proposed bicycle improvements. Most of the Federal, state, and regional programs are competitive and involve the completion of extensive applications with clear documentation of the project need, costs, and benefits. Local funding for bicycle projects typically come from Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding, which is prorated to

each County based on the return of gasoline taxes. Many of the projects and programs would need to be funded either with TDA, general fund (staff time), and regional, State and Federal sources. The primary funding sources are described below.

6.4.1. FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

6.4.1.1. Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)

TEA-21 funding is administered through the state (Caltrans or Resources Agency) and regional governments (MTC, Alameda County Transportation Authority). Most, but not all, of the funding programs are transportation versus recreational oriented, with an emphasis on reducing auto trips and providing inter-modal connections. Funding criteria often includes completion and adoption of a bicycle/pedestrian master plan, quantification of the costs and benefits of the system (such as saved vehicle trips and reduced air pollution), proof of public involvement and support, CEQA compliance, and commitment of some local resources. In most cases, TEA-21 provides matching grants of 80 to 90 percent--but prefers to leverage other monies at a lower rate. This Federal Transportation Legislation Program will end in 2003; a new transportation bill, TEA-3, will replace it in September 2003. TEA-3 is expected to continue support for many of the non-motorized programs that were contained in TEA-21, with current discussions pointing to the inclusion of new non-motorized programs.

6.4.1.2. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds are programmed by TEA-21 for projects that are likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard, and congestion mitigation. These funds can be used for a broad variety of bicycle and pedestrian projects, particularly those that are developed primarily for transportation purposes. The funds can be used either for construction of bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways or for non-construction projects related to safe bicycle and pedestrian use (maps, brochures, etc.). The projects must be tied to a plan adopted by the State and MPO.

6.4.1.3. National Highway System

National Highway System funds are for improvements to the National Highway System (NHS), which consists of an interconnected system of principal arterial routes that serve major population centers, international border crossings, airports, public transportation facilities, and other intermodal transportation facilities as well as other major travel destinations. These funds can be used to provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities constructed on NHS routes.

6.4.1.4. Federal Lands Highway Funds

Federal Lands Highway funds may be used to build bicycle and pedestrian facilities in conjunction with roads and parkways at the discretion of the department charged with administration of the funds. The projects must be transportation-related and tied to a plan adopted by the State and MPO.

6.4.2. STATE FUNDING SOURCES

6.4.2.1. National Recreational Trails Fund

The Recreational Trails Program provides funds to states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both non-motorized and motorized recreational trail uses. Examples of trail uses include hiking, bicycling, in-line skating, equestrian use, and other non-motorized as well as motorized uses.

Recreational Trails Program funds may be used for:

- Maintenance and restoration of existing trails;
- Development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages;
- Purchase and lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment;
- Construction of new trails (with restrictions for new trails on federal lands);
- Acquisition of easements or property for trails;
- State administrative costs related to this program (limited to seven percent of a State's funds); and
- Operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection related to trails (limited to five percent of a State's funds).

6.4.2.2. Bicycle Transportation Account

The State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) is an annual statewide discretionary program that is available through the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit for funding bicycle projects. Available as grants to local jurisdictions, the emphasis is on projects that benefit bicycling for commuting purposes. Due to the passage of AB1772 in the year 2000, the BTA has $7.2 million available each year until 2005. Following the year 2005, the fund will drop to $5 million per year unless new legislation is authored. The local match must be a minimum of 10% of the total project cost.

6.4.2.3. Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program Funds are allocated to projects that offset environmental impacts of modified or new public transportation facilities including streets, mass transit guideways, park-n-ride facilities, transit stations, tree planting to equalize the effects of vehicular emissions, and the acquisition or development of roadside recreational facilities, such as trails. State gasoline tax monies fund the EEMP.

6.4.2.4. Safe Routes to School (AB 1475/SB 1087)

The Safe Routes to School program is a recently created state program using funds from the Hazard Elimination Safety program from TEA-21. This program is meant to improve school commute routes by eliminating barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel through rehabilitation, new projects, and traffic calming. In September of 2004, the passage of SB 1087 extended the Safe Routes to School program for 3 additional years.

6.4.3. REGIONAL FUNDING SOURCES

6.4.3.1. Transportation Funds for Clean Air Program (TFCA)

Clean Air Funds are generated by a surcharge on automobile registration in the nine counties that make up Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Approximately $20 million is collected annually which funds two programs: the Transportation Fund for Clean Air 60%, a regional competitive fund appropriated by the BAAQMD, and the Program Manager Fund, also known as the 40% Fund, which is returned to each county to be appropriated by its' CMA or Transportation Authority.

The 40% funds are considered local funds; they are competitive and 100% discretionary. Projects must be consistent with BAAQMD's Clean Air Plan and recipient projects are required to document air quality benefits. These local funds can be used as a match for state or federal programs. Applicants for new projects must demonstrate that they applied for regional competitive TFCA funds and were denied, or that the project would not have been competitive for regional TFCA funds. Projects will be scored according to six criteria (cost effectiveness, project effectiveness, local matching funds, new programs, projects of county-wide significance, and mode shift), and reviewed by a scoring panel. The panel may recommend that some projects compete in the 60% category.

6.4.3.2. Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

MTC offers two kinds of assistance through the TLC program: capital improvement and planning. TLC grants are competitive funds meant to fund small-scale transportation improvements that are designed to make a big difference in a community's vitality. Eligible projects include streetscape improvements, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle oriented developments. Projects should be designed to "bring new vibrancy" to downtown areas, commercial cores and neighborhoods, enhancing their amenities and ambience and making them places where people want to live and visit.

6.4.4. LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES

6.4.4.1. TDA Article III (SB 821)

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article III funds are state block grants awarded annually to local jurisdictions for bicycle projects in California. These funds originate from the state gasoline tax and are distributed to local jurisdictions based on population. These funds should be used as leveraging monies for competitive state and federal sources.

6.4.4.2. ACTIA Bicycle and Pedestrian Measure B Funding

The portion of Measure B funding devoted to bicycle and pedestrian improvements totals approximately eighty million dollars, or five percent of all Measure B funding. Of this amount, seventy five percent is classified as local "pass through" funding, and is distributed to the cities and counties according to population. The remaining twenty five percent of the funding is available for countywide planning and capital projects, and is distributed based on a competitive grant process.

6.4.4.3. Regional Measure 2 and Safe Routes to Transit

Regional Measure 2 (RM2), approved in March 2004, raised the toll on seven state-owned Bay Area bridges by one dollar. This fee increase is intended to fund various transportation projects which aim to reduce congestion or to make improvements to travel in the toll bridge corridors. The RM2 funding will be divided between an operating program and a capital program. A portion of the RM2 funding totally twenty million dollars has been allotted for the Safe Routes to Transit Program (SR2T) which will provide competitive grant funding for planning and capital projects intended to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to transit facilities.

6.4.4.4. Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act

Bike paths and bike lanes can be funded as part of a local assessment or benefit district. Defining the boundaries of the benefit district may be difficult unless the facility is part of a larger parks and recreation or public infrastructure program with broad community benefits and support.

6.4.4.5. New Construction

Future road widening and construction projects are a means of providing bicycle facilities. To ensure that roadway construction projects provide facilities where needed and feasible, it is important that an effective review process be in place so that new roads meet the standards and guidelines presented in the County's Bicycle Transportation Plan.

6.4.4.6. Impact Fees

Another potential local source of funding is developer impact fees, typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by a proposed project. A developer may reduce the number of trips (and hence impacts and cost) by paying for on- and off-site bikeway improvements that will encourage residents to bicycle rather than drive. Establishing a clear nexus or connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical in avoiding a potential lawsuit.

Other opportunities for implementation will appear over time that may be used to implement the project.

Table 6-3
Funding Sources

Acronyms: AQMD - Air Quality Management District Caltrans - California Department of Transportation CMAQ - Congestion Management and Air Quality CTC - California Transportation Commission FHWA - Federal Highway Administration STANCOG – Stanislaus Council of Governments RTPA - Regional Transportation Planning Agency State DPR - California Department of Parks and Recreation (under the State Resources Agency) TEA-21 - Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century	Jurisdictions for Fremont, California: Caltrans - Caltrans District 4 ABAG—Association of Bay Area Governments ACTIA—Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority MTC—Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resources: Caltrans TEA-21 website - http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/TransEnhAct/

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
						Commute	Recreation	Safety/Ed	
Federal Funding									
TEA-21 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)	varies by RPTA	RTPAs, Caltrans	$320 m	11.47% non-federal match	cities, counties, transit operators, Caltrans, and MPOs	X	X		RSTP funds may be exchanged for local funds for non-federally certified local agencies; no match may be required if project improves safety. Contact Cathy Gomes, Caltrans, (916) 654-3271
TEA-21 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ)	Dec. 1 yearly	RTPAs, Caltrans	$400 m	11.47% non-federal match	federally certified jurisdictions	X			Counties redesignated to attainment status for ozone may lose this source. Contact Cathy Gomes, Caltrans, (916) 654-3271
TEA-21 Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)	varies by RTPA	RPTAs, Caltrans	$60 m	11.47% non-federal match	federally certified jurisdictions	X	X		Funds are dispersed through the four shares listed below.
Regional Share	varies by RTPA	RTPAs, Caltrans	$45 m	"	federal, state, or local, depending on category	X	X		Funding share to RTPAs.
Caltrans Share	varies by RTPA	Caltrans	$6.6 m	"	Caltrans	X	X		Funding share to Caltrans. Available only if regional TEA funds are not used
Statewide Transportation Enhancement Share	varies by RTPA	Caltrans, State Resources Agency	$20-30 m	"	federal, state (except Caltrans), regional and local agencies with a state partner	X	X		Funding share for all 12 TEA categories except conservation lands.
Conservation Lands Share	varies by RTPA	Caltrans, State Resources Agency	$11 m	"	RTPAs, counties, cities and non-profits.	X	X		Funding share for conservations lands category - acquisitions of scenic lands with high habitat conservation value.

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
						Commute	Recreation	Safety/Ed	
TEA-21 Recreational Trails Program (RTP)	Oct. 1	State DPR	$3 m	20% match	jurisdictions, special districts, non profits with management responsibilities over the land		X		For recreational trails to benefit bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users; contact State Dept. of Parks & Rec. , Statewide Trails Coordinator, (916) 653-8803
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program	pending	FHWA	$25 m nationwide	--	state, local, MPOs	--	--	--	Projects that improve system efficiency, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, etc. Contact K. Sue Kiser, Regional FHWA office, (916) 498-5009
Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)	May 1st	State DPR	$7.7 m statewide	50%, including in-kind	Federal, state, city, county, eligible districts		X		Federally-funded. Projects that acquire and develop outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Contact Odel King, State DPR, (916) 653-8758
State Funding									
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP)	Nov.	State Resources Agency, Caltrans	$10 m statewide	not required but favored	local, state and federal government non-profit agencies	X	X	X	Projects that enhance or mitigate future transportation projects; can include acquisition or development of roadside recreational facilities. Contact Carolyn Dudley, State Resources Agency, (916) 653-5656
Safe Routes to School (SB 10)	May 31	Caltrans	$18 m	11.5% min.	city, county	X	X	X	Primarily construction program to enhance safety of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Contact. Caltrans District 4, (510) 286-5598
Habitat Conservation Fund Grant Program	October 1	State DPR	--	50% non-state	city, county, eligible districts	-	-	-	Includes a trails/program/urban access category. Contact Odel King, State DPR, (916) 653-8758
Bicycle Transportation Account	December	Caltrans	$7.2 m	min. 10% local match on construction	city, county	X		X	State-funded. Projects that improve safety and convenience of bicycle commuters. Contact Ken McGuire, Caltrans, (916) 653-2750
Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)	December 15, odd years	RTPA	--	--	city, county, transit operators, Caltrans	X		X	Part of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the main state program for transportation project funding. For "improving transportation within the region." RTPA must program funds.
Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)	On-going	State Legislature	$5 m	--	city, county, transit operators, Caltrans	--	--	--	Bicycle and trail facilities have been funded with this program. Contact Caltrans Federal Resource Office, (916) 654-7287

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
						Commute	Recreation	Safety/Ed	
Community Based Transportation Planning Demonstration Grant Program	Nov.	Caltrans	$3 m	20% local	MPO, RPTA, city, county	X			Projects that exemplify livable community concepts. Contact Leigh Levine, Caltrans, (916) 651-6012
Office of Traffic Safety Grants	Jan. 31	Office of Traffic Safety	--	--	state, city, county			X	Bicycle and pedestrian projects have been funded through this program. Contact OTS, (916) 262-0990
Local Funding									
Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 (2% of total TDA)	Jan.	RPTA	--	--	--	--	--	--	C/CAG
ACTIA Bicycle and Pedestrian Measure B Funding		ACTIA			Any public agency that operates in Alameda County. Non-profits and private companies mist have a public agency sponsor/lead to apply	X	X	X	
RM2/SR2T		MTC			Public agencies in all 9 Bay Area counties Non-profits must partner with a public agency to apply.	X		X	Applications must demonstrate bridge congestion reduction (the "bridge nexus") on at least one state-owned Bay Area bridge.
State Gas Tax (local share)	--	State Auditor Controller	--	--	--	X		X	Allocated by State Auditor Controller
Developer Fees or Exactions (developer fee for street improvements - DFSI)	--	Cities or County	--	--	--	--	--	--	Mitigation required during land use approval process

This page intentionally left blank.